UTAH CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGER® PROGRAM

2006
ANNUAL REPORT

Sponsored by the Utah Department of Human Resource Management in partnership with the Utah System of Higher Education

STATE OF UTAH
CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGER® TRAINING PROGRAM
ANNUAL REPORT 2006

CONTENTS

REPORT COMPILED BY:

Sherry Saracino
Michelle Watts
John J. Acker Jr.
Utah Department of Human Resource Management

ADMINISTRATION:

Jeff C. Herring, JD/MBA
Executive Director
Utah Department of Human Resource Management

Richard E. Kendell, Ph.D
Commissioner of Higher Education
Utah System of Higher Education

James N. West, Ph.D
Director, Policy
Utah Department of Human Resource Management

John J. Acker Jr., MS, CPM
CPM Director
Utah Department of Human Resource Management

Sherry Saracino
CPM Coordinator
Utah Department of Human Resource Management

SUBMITTED TO:

National Certified Public Manager® Consortium
by
State of Utah
Department of Human Resource Management

I. ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

1. Agency(s) Responsible For Program Administration:
    Utah Department of Human Resource Management
    Utah System of Higher Education

2. Name, Title of Program Director
    John J. Acker Jr., MS/CPM
    CPM Program Director
    Utah Department of Human Resource Management

3. Program Dates
    1. Date program began: August 1987
    2. Date of Accreditation: 1989
    3. Re-accreditations: 1994; 1999; 2004

4. Authorization
    Executive Proclamation - August 11, 1987
    Executive Proclamation - May 30, 1995

5. Funding Sources/Amounts (Note any changes)
    The program is funded through tuition paid by the participants or their
    agencies. The fee is $650.00 per course for locations in the metropolitan
    Salt Lake Area and $750.00 for areas outside that parameter. It is the
    intent of the State of Utah and the Department of Human Resource
    Management to have this program self-supporting.

6. Program Staff
    Two (2) part time administrators
    One (1) full time administrator
    One (1) full time staff member
    Eight (8) contract instructors

    Names and Titles are as follows:
    Administration:
    James N. West, Ph.D., Director, Policy; Member At-large, Executive
    Council, National CPM Consortium; Member, Board of Directors, National
    CPM Consortium
    John J. Acker Jr., MS/CPM, Utah CPM Director, Member, Board of
    Directors, National CPM Consortium
    Sherry Saracino, Utah CPM Coordinator
    *Jennifer Wakefield served as CPM Coordinator from January – June

Staff:
Sharon Foard, CPM Program Support Technician
*Jerry Lynne Aszmus, CPM Program Support Specialist, Advisory Board Liaison from January - May

Contract Instructors:
Joan L. Burnside, Ph.D.
Jill Carter, MPA
Ken Embley, MPA
Ronald Vandermyde, BS
Russell Wright, Ph.D.
Kevin R. Miller, M.Ed.
Pamela Gardiol, MA
Jerry Bassford, Ph.D.

7. Administrative Structure
   The program was administered by the Department of Human Resource Management. The Executive Director of the Department, Jeff Herring, reported directly to the Governor. The CPM program was administered under the Policy Division, James N. West, Director. John J. Acker Jr. was the CPM Director reporting to James West. Jenny Wakefield served as CPM Coordinator from January to June and Sherry Saracino was Coordinator from September through December. Sharon Foard provided administrative support. Jerry Aszmus also provided administrative support from January to May.

   The Utah System of Higher Education is the program's educational partner. Richard E. Kendall, Commissioner of Higher Education and Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents, represents the System. Gary S. Wixom, Assistant Commissioner, also represents Higher Education at CPM events. The partnership with Higher Education provides access to all nine institutions of higher learning for instructors as well as curriculum development.

8. Administrative Changes During Past Year
   Sherry Saracino was named the CPM Program Coordinator in September. Individuals who are no longer involved in the program since last year are: Jennifer Wakefield, Jerry Lynne Aszmus, and May Chanthappanha.

9. Policy Changes During Past Year
   No policy changes to report.

II. SESSION/PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

1. Sessions
    CPM in Utah is taught in 3 separate courses. The courses are titled 1, 2 and 3. Courses 1 and 2 may be taken in either order. Students must complete or be concurrently enrolled in course 1 & 2 prior to enrolling in Course 3. In 2005, the following numbers of sessions were offered:

    1. Course 1
        8 sessions 100 hours (*12 eight hour days)
        * 96 class hours plus 4-20 hours outside class

    2. Course 2
        7 sessions 100 hours (*12 eight hour days)
        * 96 class hours plus 4-20 hours outside class

    3. Course 3
        7 sessions 100 hours (*12 eight hour days)
        * 96 class hours plus 4-20 hours outside class

Total Sessions in 2005	29	Total Hours 2900
Total Sessions in 2006	22	Total Hours 2200
Decrease in Sessions from 2005	7	Total Hours 800
Decrease in Sessions (percentage)		24%

EXHIBIT A

Certified Public Manager Participation Information
2006

Level	Total Participants	Number Graduated	Female Participants (% of Total)	Male Participants (% of Total)
Course 1	152	128	82(54%)	70(46%)
Course 2	128	117	76 (59%)	52 (41%)
Course 3	135	135	82 (61%)	53 (39%)
	415	380	240 (58%)	175 (42%)

*Decrease over last year: 163 participants (29%)

2. Projects

   Team projects are required for Course 3. Twenty-two (22) projects were completed by teams in 2006. In the previous year 21 projects were completed. This represents a 5% increase.

3. Examinations

   Students are required to demonstrate performance outcomes for each module of courses 1, 2, and 3. These outcomes are listed at: http://www.dhrm.utah.gov/training/performanceOutcomes.html. Twenty-four (16%) students in Course 1 and eleven (9%) students in Course 2 did not satisfy the outcomes during 2006 (note: students are permitted to complete outcomes in subsequent quarters). All Course 3 students satisfied outcomes. Students in Course 3 are required to complete an extensive team project which includes original research, data compilation, and a formal presentation.

III. DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Participant Numbers

   (See Exhibit A above)

   *Note: data on percentages of minority and disabled participants is not gathered.

2. Graduates

   The current three-course format was initiated in Fall 1996

   1. Total number of graduates of first two levels

      Course 1 Fall 1996 – Fall 2006: 1668

      Course 2 Fall 1996 – Fall 2006: 1244

   2. Number of graduates of first two levels in 2006

      Course 1: 118

      Course 2: 106

   3. Percentage change from 2005:

      Course 1: -46%

      Course 2: -26%

   4. Total number of Course 3 CPM graduates:

      1996-2006 (current curriculum): 895

      1989-1995: 189

      Total graduates in history: 1084

      Number of CPM graduates 2006: 135

      Percentage change from 2005: -6%

3. Participant Sources:

EXHIBIT B

<table>
<thead>
<tr><th colspan="3">Participant Percentages by Public Entity</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>1997-2006
(ten year period)</th><th>2006</th></tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr><td>Percentage from State</td><td>92.8%</td><td>96%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Percentage from Counties</td><td>1%</td><td>.7%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Percentage from Cities</td><td>3%</td><td>1.7%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Percentage from Federal</td><td>.7%</td><td>0%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Percentage from Other</td><td>2.5%</td><td>1.5%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Number of new agencies</td><td></td><td>4</td></tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. PROGRAM INFORMATION

1. **Program design or curriculum changes introduced during the year**
   No significant changes were made to the program design or curriculum this year.

2. **Program delivery changes introduced during the year**
   Distance (video conferencing) education of Courses 1 & 2 was discontinued. Feedback regarding this delivery mode was not as positive as anticipated.

3. **Special Events held during the year**
   1. *Annual graduation ceremony*: Held July 13, 2006. 138 graduates were designated Certified Public Managers. The ceremony was attended by Bill Herman, President of the AACPM; Assistant Commissioner Gary Wixom from Higher Education; Jeff Herring, Executive Director, Department of Human Resource Management; JJ Acker, Director, Utah CPM Program; Julie Felice, President-Elect of the AACPM; Craig Coulson, President, Utah CPM Society; Suzette Green-Wright, President-Elect, Utah CPM Society; agency directors; CPM administrators and instructors, friends, families, managers, and colleagues of the graduates.

   2. *7th Annual Managers Conference:* Held May 4, 2006. The State Department of Human Resource Management and the Utah CPM Society co-sponsor an annual management development conference. This collaborative effort is organized by a committee consisting of equal representation from Department of Human Resource Management and the Utah CPM Society. This year's conference title was "Talknology: Lead, Inspire, Connect Through Effective Communication" consisting of several different speakers including Neil Staker of PeopleSmart Solutions, Governor Jon Huntsman Jr., and Amanda Dickson of KSL Radio. There were 310 attendees.

3. *Utah State Manager of the Year Award:* The Department of Human Resource Management together with the Utah CPM Society conduct a nomination and selection process, then formally present the award. In 2006, the award was presented to Richard Anderson, Director of Division of Child & Family Services, Department of Human Services.

4. **Summary of evaluation methods and results during the year**
   1. *Student Evaluations.* For each course, students are evaluated through written papers and practical exercises. Course 3 students must complete a comprehensive practicum project. Project deliverables include a written charter, project plan, formal compilation of project findings and an evaluated oral presentation to the chartering client, guests, and the instructor.
   2. *Program Evaluations.* Participants complete an individual reaction evaluation at the conclusion of each course. Evaluations are used to gather data on participants' feelings regarding aspects of the course and the instructors' performance. These measures are tracked and linked to statewide performance measures in training and development. The evaluation instrument was modified in Fall 2006 and placed in a web-based format. Response rates declined and numerous technical difficulties occurred. Further modification and experimentation will occur.
   3. The aggregate results indicate that high perceived value and satisfaction with both courses and instructors. Some students continue to express concern over required class time and workload.

5. **Academic Credit**
   No academic credit is offered. Some professional organizations offer continuing education credit for CPM. The program provides necessary documentation for those requesting it. The State of Utah CPM Program discontinued participation in the American Council on Education's (ACE) Credit Recommendation Service as of December 2004. No individuals completed applications or received recommendation from ACE in 2006.

6. **Pay & Promotion Incentives**
   The State of Utah CPM Program has no authority to offer or mandate pay or promotion incentives. However, some agencies or divisions do offer a one-step (2.75%) raise for CPM completion. CPM is also a preference listed on some management recruitment information.

7. **Support of CPM Society**
   CPM program participates in the Utah Society of Certified Public Managers. All administrators are members of the society. One representative from the program administration serves as a non-voting member of the society's board of directors. A member from the society's board sits also on the program's advisory board. Society board members are invited to classes each quarter to recruit new members. Instructors avail themselves to present at monthly luncheon meetings sponsored by

 the society. Additionally, the program and the society co-sponsor the State of Utah Annual Managers Conference. The profits from this event are split 50/50 between the society and the program. The society also co-sponsors the Manager of the Year selection and ceremony and participates in the annual CPM graduation ceremony.

V. FUTURE GOALS & PROGRESS

- **NEW! Increase administrative efficiency.** The capacity to focus on strategic goals and continuous improvement will increase when time-intensive processes and details are refined or modified to require less labor. *Web-based course evaluation was piloted in Fall 2006 and will continue to be refined. Web-based registration is due to be implemented for Fall 2007.*
- **New! Focus on the fundamentals.** It is imperative that CPM curriculum focus on universal and core issues to public management. Efforts will be made to evaluate curriculum and reduce unnecessary or overly specialized topics. Where applicable, classroom time can be reduced. *This goal is in planning and review. Several modules are being evaluated for reduction, combination, or elimination. Other solutions being considered include web-based curriculum in blended learning formats or mini-module formats for information and compliance-based material.*
- **Strengthen administrative support for the program.** The number of students and instructors has doubled since 2002 while the number of administrative staff remained the same. Presently, we are at our maximum capacity of growth. We intend to increase our capacity for growth by increasing administrative support. This will also better enable us to address other strategic goals. *This goal was addressed in 2006 with the creation of a full-time coordinator position in September. Without dedicated attention, administrative records and enrollment began to decline in late 2005. This trend continued in 2006. There are also plans for changes in full-time support to increase capacity and simplify complex processes that were established for a much smaller program.*
- **Add focus groups and short surveys to the program evaluation methods.** With the ability to respond to student and organizational demands more rapidly, focus groups and short surveys may produce many useful ideas and triggers to help continuous improvements efforts remain robust and responsive to emerging trends and needs. Diverse methods of collecting feedback will add depth and breadth to feedback. *This goal has not been addressed yet.*
- **Strengthen Selection Criteria and Methods for Prospective Students.** Exploring and/or developing specific selection criteria and orientation practices to help students adequately prepare for the program will increase the quality of their overall experience and ability to apply skills and principles. *In November 2005, the Advisory Board provided recommendations for accomplishing this goal. A framework was formulated in 2006 to establish closer supervisory contact for better workplace coaching and concurrent application by communicating with and advising supervisors. Additionally a web-based "orientation" will be added to assist new students with adequate preparation. Web-based curriculum platform is currently in development to enable this technology.*

- **Increase number of standardized student evaluation instruments.** In addition to the capstone curriculum project, the program will seek to add several smaller standard assignments that incorporate knowledge and skills from several modules. The intent is to better integrate modules for continuity and to increase consistency in evaluation. *This goal has not been addressed yet, but will most likely be facilitated through web-based assignments.*
- **Create concurrent application assignments.** Standardized assignments should make an effort to target actual workplace applications with some measure of supervisor/job mentor involvement. Rather than aim for post-training workplace transference, assignments should integrate workplace issues and context into the training event. *Instructors have been encouraged to address this goal and have reported progress. An increasing number of workplace application assignments have been integrated into curriculum.*
- **Obtain or devise distance learning mechanisms or alternative delivery approaches to reach rural population.** In order to make CPM available statewide, new technologies, formats or mechanisms are needed. The program will need to stay flexible in structure to adapt to rural needs. *After Winter 2006, video-conferencing was curtailed. While Courses 1 and 2 were estimated to be fairly conducive to the format, students overall reported having a less valuable experience than their colleagues who participated in on-site classes. A major factor was the phenomenon of "video-fatigue" (watching a screen all day). Experiments with blended learning, using web-based delivery combined with on-site delivery, may offer a richer experience while reducing travel needs.*
- **Create post-CPM workplace measurement tools.** There is a need to measure the return on investment of the CPM program. Post-CPM measurement strategies need to be created to determine the degree to which graduates of the program impact their organizations and apply skills and principles learned in CPM. *This goal has not been addressed yet.*

VI. PROGRAM STRENGTHS

- The program is a "best buy", maintaining the lowest cost of any self-funded CPM Program. Additionally, the program competes with other local management development programs which are significantly higher in price and less comprehensive. The cost per participant hour has remained at $6.50 since 2000. That represents a *19% cost savings to students in 2006 over 2000 course fees.
  *Consumer Price Index, U.S. Bureau of Statistics
- The program focuses on competencies and learning outcomes. In 2005, the National CPM Consortium adopted a competency model that Utah CPM contributed to in development. This emphasis, which departs from the traditional focus on conveying subjects and content, identifies for prospective participants and their supervisors what they can expect to perform as a result of their participation. Furthermore, the program requires students to demonstrate skills and competencies in their program experience. The Utah program is poised for continued advancement in this area and is prepared for national reaccredidation in 2009, when full conversion to competencies is expected.

- Excellent instructors have contributed to a strong reputation for CPM throughout the State. Instructors are diverse, experienced, and well-esteemed by current and former students. Most have extensive experience in the public sector and provide consultation, coaching and training to various public sector leaders and organizations. The selection of instructors is a very competitive and thorough process.
- The use of instructors as specialists rather than generalists has enabled us to employ instructors in areas of their forte. This format also allows us to integrate new instructors carefully before immersing them in heavy course loads.
- Strong presence and active participation in the National Certified Public Manager® Consortium enables us to participate in shaping strategic directions on a national scale and forward the interests of the Utah CPM program. Both James West and J.J. Acker served on the Board of Directors of the National Certified Public Manager® Consortium during 2006. J.J. served as a Member-at-large on the Executive Council, chairing the Standard Operating Procedures committee.
- Healthy relationship with the Utah Society of Certified Public Managers, including reciprocal liaisons and joint ventures, has created goodwill to promote the program and support the continuing success and development of graduates. Alumni of the program are found among the greatest promoters and are actively utilized in marketing and promotion. Alumni have served as AACPM officers, senior executives and program directors in federal, state, and not-for-profit organizations, and front-line supervisors throughout the public sector.
- The program's modular design and lack of dependence on static texts or manuals enable the program to shift and change quickly on demand. Continuous improvement is able to occur with purpose and speed. Program administration is lean and further enables purposeful change to occur with little administrative or bureaucratic interference.
- The program focuses on a principle we call "concurrent application." This means that emphasis is placed on skill practice and application in the direct context of the participant's work setting. The participant is able to learn and apply in the same setting.

EXHIBIT C
CPM Participants by Organization - 1997-2006 (ten year period)

Organizations	97	98	99	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Administrative Services	35	42	32	18	9	18	26	19	17	3	219
Alcohol & Beverage	38	12	10	10	16	1	2	4	5	5	103
Agriculture	27	10	8	9	13	3	2	6	3	2	83
Attorney General	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	8
Auditor	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Carbon Co. Sheriff's Dept.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Capitol Preservation Board	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
City and County	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Commerce	0	2	0	2	2	1	2	4	4	4	21
Community and Culture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Community Action	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Community & Econ. Dev.	11	5	6	21	21	18	11	6	6	0	105
Corrections	14	1	3	11	15	8	18	35	33	34	172
Courts	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	4
Crime Victims Reparation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Criminal & Juvenile Justice	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Davis County Library	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Federal Government	2	3	8	9	0	1	1	2	1	0	27
Health Policy Commission	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Human Resource Mgt.	7	13	7	1	4	7	13	4	0	3	59
Education	26	12	10	15	3	14	12	33	38	27	190
Environmental Quality	4	8	1	1	3	2	6	15	24	18	82
Financial Institutions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	5
Governors/Lt Gov's Office	0	0	1	2	0	4	4	3	2	0	16
Health	30	20	9	10	6	9	16	23	27	16	166
Housing Authority-County SL	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	7	4	30
Human Services	74	16	9	1	3	1	4	6	15	12	141
Insurance	0	3	0	3	1	0	3	3	2	4	19
Iron County	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kearns City	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3
Labor Commission	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	11
Layton City	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Legislative Printing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Local Boards of Health	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Murray City	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	14
Natural Resources	44	20	63	37	30	48	42	31	84	59	458
No. Eastern Counseling Cntr.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Office of Recovery Svcs.	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5
Ogden Area CAP	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Public Employ. Health Plan	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Public Safety	39	23	35	14	15	25	32	12	23	21	239
Public Service Commission	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rehabilitation	0	0	0	0	5	17	24	0	0	0	46
Roosevelt City	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
S.L. Airport Authority	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Schools for the Deaf & Blind	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Sevier County Sheriff	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
St. George City	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tax Commission	48	23	21	26	33	17	16	24	22	13	243
Technology Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Transportation	13	17	17	15	14	34	42	42	49	28	271
Trust Lands S & I	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5
Uintah School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Valley ER Comm. Cntr	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	4	2	2	19
Vineyard Town	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

Weber County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Weber State University	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
West Jordan	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
West Valley City	0	34	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	52
West Valley Housing Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Workforce Services	10	28	46	41	32	64	72	132	185	120	730
Other(private/no indication)	0	20	0	0	7	1	14	4	5	2	53
Totals	449	318	311	261	243	304	384	438	578	404	3690